

Case No. 1:20-cv-132
Gwin, J.

At the very least, however, district courts should request an attorney to represent the plaintiff when lack of representation would otherwise result in “fundamental unfairness impinging on due process rights.”⁵

At this time, the Court declines to exercise its discretion to request an attorney to represent Plaintiff Rose. Plaintiff’s suit does not appear to involve particularly complex factual and legal questions, and Plaintiff has so far demonstrated an ability to represent herself.

Further, although Rose states that she previously had two attorneys who were willing to take her case on a contingency basis, but unwilling to take it to trial, Plaintiff does not state whether she has sought the services of attorneys beyond those two to represent her on a pro bono or contingency-fee basis.⁶ Plaintiff Rose makes claims that would allow fee-shifting if Plaintiff wins.

Plaintiff has not demonstrated that her situation is exceptional. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion for the appointment of counsel.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 18, 2020

s/ James S. Gwin
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁵ *Reneer*, 975 F.2d at 261 (quoting *Caruth v. Pinkney*, 683 F.2d 1044, 1048 (7th Cir. 1982)).

⁶ Doc. 10.